DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 356 HE 000 249

By-Paltridge, James Gilbert
Organizational Forms which Characterize Statewide Coordination of Public Higher Education.
California Univ., Berkeley. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.
Pub Date Jun 65
Note-18p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.00
Descriptors-*Coordination, *Higher Education, *Interinstitutional Cooperation, Organization, *State Agencies

A taxonomy was devised for describing and classifying organizational characteristics that have set the pattern for the coordinating mechanisms in 41 states. The information assembled covers a period of years dating back to the beginnings of coordination in each state so that historic trends can be seen. The significant emerging trends are (1) The number of states relying upon neither statutory nor voluntary organizations for interinstitutional cooperation markedly decreased, particularly during 1955-65 when demand for higher education showed its greatest growth and institutions became more complex. (2) The number of states relying upon voluntary associations to perform the coordinating function increased in 1960 but several were supplanted by other organizational forms (statutory in every case). (3) The number of states creating various forms of statutory coordinating agencies, boards, or commissions markedly increased after 1960. In 22 states, there was no significant change in the pattern of coordination from 1945 to 1965. Among most of the remaining 28 states, however, the trends seem to indicate an evolutionary movement from no coordination, to voluntary coordination, to a form of public regulatory coordination. (JS)

EDO 30356

ORGANIZATIONAL FORMS WHICH CHARACTERIZE STATEWIDE COORDINATION OF PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

James Gilbert Paltridge

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

University of California

Berkeley, June, 1965

HE 000 249

ORGANIZATIONAL FORMS WHICH CHARACTERIZE STATEWIDE COORDINATION OF PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

Introductory

The purpose of this study is to devise a taxonomy for describing and classifying organizational characteristics which have set the pattern for the coordinating mechanisms in all but nine of the fifty states. The information necessary for this task has been assembled to cover a period of years dating back to the beginnings of the activity in each state so that historic trends would emerge.

Previous studies and surveys in this general subject area have focused on the characteristics of the individual boards created in each state -- the institutional boards, coordinating boards, governing or other supervisory boards, and other related organizations -- without, in most cases, drawing a statewide summary picture which reflects the organizational philosophy predominating in the state when the boards were created or when significant organizational changes were made.

It brings up to date certain of the information which has been available by extrapolation from the 1952 Report of the Council of State Governments and the 1960 survey of Martorana and Hollis published by the United States Office of Information. It draws upon a number of other more recently published reports, surveys and treatises on state higher education organization which are listed in the Appendix.

A present limitation of this report must be noted. The Survey of State Legislation Relating to Higher Education, heretofore published by the Office of Education in the form of periodic preliminary mailings and in an annual compilation, was discontinued prior to compilation of data on actions by the 1965 state legislatures. Hence some information on the organizational changes adopted by some of these legislatures may be incomplete. In some cases the assumption (possibly erroneous) has been made that organizational forms known to have been in existence prior to 1965 do in fact still exist, unless information to the contrary was found.

I

TYPES OF ORGANIZATION: BY STATES, BY YEARS

This study categorizes the predominant pattern of each state's organization for coordination into one of five types and three subtypes, which are defined as follows:

Type #1. No coordinating organization created by statute, nor voluntary association performing a significant coordinating function.

Type #2. Coordination by voluntary association of institutional representatives the aim of which is some form of coordination on an inter-institutional level.

Type #3. Coordination by a single or a consolidated governing board which has governing authority over all public higher education institutions, or all except the junior colleges (which cases are noted in Table I by an asterisk).

Type #4. Coordination by a governing-coordinating board. This category was created to accommodate the characterization of the New York system where legal responsibility has been placed in one board to govern several institutions and to coordinate certain policies and/or functions of a number of other four-year institutions. Some authors have classed this board as a "coordinating board," others as a "single or consolidated board."

Type #5. Coordination through boards or commissions created by statute but not superseding the institutional boards. Sub-types of this form of organization are:

#5a. An advisory board composed, in the majority, of institutional representatives or other professional educationists.

#5b. An advisory board composed, in the majority, of public representatives.

#5c. A regulatory board, one which has legal responsibility for organizing, regulating, or otherwise bringing together certain policies or functions in areas such as planning, budgeting, and programming, but which does not have authority to govern institutions. These boards are composed entirely or in the majority of public representatives.

The basic compilation of information considered in this report is shown in Table I which follows.

Table I

Types of Organizations, and Changes within States

	Prior to 1939	1940 to 1949	1950 to 1959	1960 to 1965
Alabama	Type #1	Type #1	Type #1	Type #1
Alaska	1935-Board of Regents, University of Alaska Type #3*	Type #3*	Type #3*	Type #3*
Arizona	Type #1	1945-Arizona Board of Regents Type #3*	Type #3*	Type #3*
Arkansas	Type #1	Type #1	Voluntary Association Type #2	1961-Commission on Coordination of Higher Educational Finance Type #5b
California	Type #1	1945-Liaison Committee Type #2	Type #2	1960-California Coordinating Council Type #5a
Colorado	Type #1	Type #1	Type #1	1961-Colorado Assn. of State Institutions Type #2 1965-Colo. Commission on Higher Education Type #5c
Connecticut	Type #1	Type #1	Type #1	1965-Commission for Higher Education Type #5b
Delaware	Type #1	Type #1	Type #1	Type #1

	Prior to 1939	1940 to 1949	1950 to 1959	1960 to 1965
Florida	1905-Florida Board of Control Type #3	Type #3	Type #3	1965-Florida Board of Regents Type #3
Georgia	1931-Regents of the University System of Georgia Type #3	Type #3	Type #3	Type #3
Hawaii	1907-Board of Regents, Univ. of Hawaii Type #3	Type #3	Type #3	Type #3
Idaho	1913-State Board of Education and Board of Regents Type #3	Type #3	Type #3*	Type #3*
Illinois	Type #1	Illinois Joint Council of Higher Education Type #2	1957-Illinois Commission of Higher Education Type #5b	1962-State Board of Higher Education Type #5c
Indiana	Type #1	Type #1	1951-Indiana Conference for Coordination Type #2	Type #2
Iowa	1906-State Board of Regents Type #3	Type #3*	Type #3*	Type #3*
Kansas	1939-State Board of Regents Type #3	Type #3*	Type #3*	Type #3*
Kentucky	1934-Council formed but inactive Type #5a	Type #5a	1952-Council on Public Higher Education Type #5a	Type #5b

	Prior to 1939	1940 to 1949	1950 to 1959	1960 to 1965
Louisiana	Type #1	Type #1	Type #1	---State Coordinating Council on Education Type #5b
Maine	Type #1	Type #1	Type #1	Type #1
Maryland	Type #1	Type #1	Type #1	1962-Advisory Council for Higher Education Type # 5a 1963-(New) Advisory Council for Higher Education Type #5b
Massachusetts	Type #1	Type #1	Type #1	1965-Board of Higher Education Type #5a
Michigan	Type #1	Type #1	Type #1	1961-Michigan Council of State College Presidents Type #2 1964-State Board of Education Type #5c
Minnesota	Type #1	Type #1	1959-Minnesota Liaison Committee Type #2	1965-Minnesota Liaison and Facilities Commission for Higher Education Type #5a
Mississippi	1910-Board of Trustees of Institutions of Higher Learning Type #3*	1944-Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning Type #3*	Type #3*	Type #3*
Missouri	Type #1	Type #1	1959-Missouri Council on Higher Education Type #2	1963-Missouri Commission on Higher Education Type #5b

	Prior to 1939	1940 to 1949	1950 to 1959	1960 to 1965
Montana	State Board of Education Type #3	Type #3	Type #3	Type #3
Nebraska	Type #1	Type #1	Type #1	Type #1
Nevada	Board of Regents, University of Nevada Type #3	Type #3	Type #3	Type #3
New Hampshire	Type #1	Type #1	Type #1	1963-Board of Trustees (see footnote 1) Type #3*
New Jersey	Type #1	1947-State Board of Education Type #1	Type #1	Board of Higher Education Type #5c
New Mexico	Type #1	Type #1	1951-Board of Educational Finance Type #5c	Type #5c
New York	1784-Board of Regents, University of State of New York Type #5c	1949-Board of Trustees, State University of New York Type #4	Type #4	Type #4
North Carolina	Type #1	Type #1	1955-North Carolina Board of Higher Education Type #5c	1962 changes Type #5b
North Dakota	1939-State Board of Higher Education Type #3	Type #3*	Type #3*	Type #3*

	Prior to 1939	1940 to 1949	1950 to 1959	1960 to 1965
Ohio	Type #1	Type #1	1951-Ohio Inter-University Council Type #2	1963-Ohio Board of Regents Type #5c
Oklahoma	Type #1	1941-Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education Type #5c	Type #5c	Type #5c
Oregon	1929-Oregon State Board of Higher Education Type #3	Type #3*	Type #3*	Type #3*
Pennsylvania	Type #1	Type #1	Type #1	1963-State Board of Education Type #5c
Rhode Island	1939-Board of Trustees of State Colleges Type #3	Type #3	Type #3	Type #3
South Carolina	Type #1	Type #1	Type #1	1962-Advisory Committee Type #5b
South Dakota	1896-Board of Regents of all Higher Education Type #3	Type #3	Type #3	Type #3
Tennessee	Type #1	Type #1	Type #1	Type #1
Texas	Type #1	Type #1	1955-Texas Commission on Higher Education Type #5c	1965-Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System Type #5c

	Prior to 1939	1940 to 1949	1950 to 1959	1960 to 1965
Utah	Type #1	Type #1	1959-Coordinating Council on Higher Education Type #5b	Type #5b
Vermont	Type #1	Type #1	Type #1	Type #1
Virginia	Type #1	Type #1	1956-State Council on Higher Education Type #5b	Type #5b
Washington	Type #1	Type #1	Type #1	--- Type #2
West Virginia	Type #1	Type #1	Type #1	---Joint Liaison Committee Type #2
Wisconsin	Type #1	Type #1	1955-Coordinating Committee Type #5a	1965-Coordinating Committee Type #5c
Wyoming	1890-Trustees of University of Wyoming Type #3	Type #3	Type #3*	Type #3*

Footnote 1:
New Hampshire also created a coordinating council of institutional representatives to coordinate the work of the consolidated board (four-year institutions) with that of the junior colleges.

II

TYPES OF ORGANIZATIONS: SUMMARY OF TRENDS

A summary of the state data by categories or types of coordinating organizational mechanisms is given in Table II.

The following seem to be significant trends which are now emerging.

1. The number of states which rely upon neither statutory nor voluntary organizations for an inter-institution coordination function has shown a marked decrease, particularly during the past decade when demand for higher education has shown its greatest growth and institutions have become more complex. In the states remaining in this category, studies of the need for coordination and for state "master plans" have been authorized by the legislatures.

2. The number of states relying upon voluntary associations to perform the coordinating function increased in 1960 but several have been supplanted in very recent years by other organizational forms (statutory in every case) to show an apparent decrease in this form. It is a matter of record that some of these were formed initially in efforts to circumvent imposition of statutory and regulatory forms.

3. The number of states creating various forms of statutory coordinating agencies, boards or commissions has shown a marked increase since 1960. The number of boards composed entirely or in the majority of public representatives has shown a greater increase than those boards the majority (or entirety) of whose members are representatives of the institutions subject to coordination. The number of boards

which have been given regulatory powers in one or more areas of coordination appears to be increasing more rapidly than either of the forms of advisory boards, though it is not greater than the aggregate of the advisory boards.

Table II

Types of Organizations in Use, Selected Years

States characterized by:	1940	1950	1960	1963	1965
1. No coordinating organization	33	29	18	9	6
2. Voluntary associations	0	2	6*	6*	3
3. Consolidated governing board	15	16	16	17	17
4. Governing-coordinating board	0**	1	1	1	1
5a. Coordinating-advisory, institutional representatives	1	1	2	6	3
5b. Coordinating-advisory, public representatives	0	0	3	6	10
5c. Coordinating-regulatory, public representatives	1**	1***	4	5	10
(Total States)	50	50	50	50	50

* Between 1960 and 1963 three states discontinued voluntary coordination; three adopted it.

** The New York Board of Regents, founded in 1784, fits closely the modern concept categorized herein as Type 5c. The Board of Trustees, State University of New York, organized in 1949, did not supersede the Regents. The latter governs a large number of institutions and coordinates the budgets and certain other affairs of other public institutions, and therefore sets the dominant (and unique) characteristic of this state's organization, which hereafter is classified Type #4.

*** Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, first organized in 1941, is the first modern version of this organization type.

III

APPEARANCE OF EVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT

In twenty-two states there has so far been no significant change in coordination over the past two or more decades. These are the six states in which no coordination yet exists, the fifteen which since at least prior to 1939 have had single or consolidated governing boards, and New York whose pattern has not essentially changed over the years.

Among the remaining 28 states, however, there seem to be some significant trends of a type which might point towards an "evolutionary" movement.

Ten of these states have followed a pattern of change characterized by movement from no coordination--to voluntary coordination--to a form of public regulatory coordination. Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, and Colorado went first to strongly organized voluntary associations before they changed, or were changed, to statutory, regulatory (in various degrees) coordinating organizations. Oklahoma, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Texas followed the same pattern of change, but did not have so long or so strong a "voluntary" stage. Wisconsin's pattern was similar, except that it went through an additional stage for ten years prior to 1965 when it had a coordinating board of institutional representatives which held a number of quite strong regulatory powers but chose to act only in an advisory capacity. Now the public representatives have been placed in the majority, and given the mandate to use these powers.

Eight of these states have followed a pattern of change from no coordination--to voluntary coordination--to advisory coordination by public representatives. This is the case in Arkansas, Utah, Missouri, and Virginia, though the latter two had briefer experiences with voluntary methods. This pattern is also that of Maryland, South Carolina, Connecticut and North Carolina, except that Maryland had a brief experience prior to 1964 with an advisory board of institutional representatives before changing to an advisory board of public representatives, and North Carolina first adopted a regulatory board for coordination but under political pressure most of its regulatory powers were changed to advisory powers.

Three states remain with advisory boards composed primarily of institutional representatives. California's present advisory board of principally institutional representatives evolved from a long period of voluntary coordination by its Joint Liaison Committee. Of some significance is the 1965 change in the composition of this coordinating council which saw the number of public representatives increased from three to six (though still not providing them with a majority). Massachusetts and Minnesota have recently adopted this form, the latter after a long history of voluntary coordination.

Of the remaining seven states which have undergone some change in coordination organization, two have consolidated their institutional boards into a single governing board. These are New Hampshire and Arizona. Three (at least to date) have changed only once--from no coordination to voluntary coordination. The other two have adopted

limited forms of advisory coordination by public representatives.

The evolutionary trend in 20 states is quite clear. Each of these has gone through at least two different forms of coordinating organization. Each now undertakes its coordinating activity through boards or councils created by their legislatures--and half of these states have given their boards some regulatory powers in addition to advisory powers, and they have created these boards with a majority of public members.

APPENDIX

Information Sources

"Higher Education in the Forty-Eight States," Council of State Governments, Chicago, Illinois, 1952.

Martorana, S. V., and Hollis, E. V., State Boards Responsible for Higher Education, Circular No. 619, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington, 1960.

_____, Survey of State Legislation Relating to Higher Education, Circular No. 748, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington, 1963.

_____, above, "Periodic Mailings," 1964.

Glenny, L. A., Autonomy of Public Colleges, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1959.

_____, "State Systems and Plans for Higher Education," in Logan Wilson (ed.) Autonomy and Interdependence - Emerging Systems in Higher Education, American Council on Education, Washington, 1964.

Moos, M., and Rourke, F. E., The Campus and the State, Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1959.

Chambers, M. M., Voluntary Statewide Coordination, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1961.

Brumbaugh, A. J., State-wide Planning and Coordination, Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, 1963.

Legislative reports, various.

Personal correspondence with state and legislative officials.